

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 02/29/2008. Claims 5-7, 15 and 18 were cancelled. Examiner assumes that Applicant's declaration in the "REMARKS" section of the arguments filed 2/29/2008 was in error and that Applicant intended to cancel Claim 18, not 19 as stated. Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16-17 and 19 have been examined and are pending.
- 2) This office action is made **Final**.
- 3) The text of those sections of Title 35 U.S.C. 101 and 103(a) not included in the action can be found in a prior office action.
- 4) Wright et al., Kaplan et al., Walsh et al., Boesch, Delaney and Microsoft were cited as prior art in the previous office action. The teachings that are applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

Response to Arguments

- 5) Applicant's arguments and amendment, see "OBJECTION TO CLAIM 17", filed 02/29/2008, with respect to the objection to Claim 17 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of Claim 17 has been withdrawn.

- 6) Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 02/29/2008 with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of Claims 17 and 19 have been withdrawn.
- 7) In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Kaplan et al. with Wright et al. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Automatically executing files, taught by Kaplan et al., is a processing rule, as taught by Wright et al. The teaching comes directly from Kaplan as cited below and in the prior office action. The fact that Applicant may have recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

- 8) Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 2/29/2008 with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the arguments, Applicant argued that:

A. Wright does not teach or suggest "a file I/O unit which inputs and outputs a file from said clients" and "a processing unit which stores the file input from the file I/O unit into the file storage unit in conformity with a predefined processing rule", as recited in claim 1. See also independent claims 14 and 17 reciting similar features.

Instead, Wright discusses instructions for processing and storage of a document image where the instructions indicate preferences for images that have been supplied by the users for their images such as performing image cleaning and clarification, rotating the image, and performing optical character recognition on the image (see, paragraphs 15, 94 and 98). As discussed above, the independent claims patentably distinguish over Wright. Further, as Kaplan merely discusses embedded or dedicated devices for playback of multimedia content or other suitable devices (see, paragraphs 6 and 30), Kaplan does not cure the deficiencies of regarding the independent claims of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that Kaplan and Wright do not teach or suggest the above- discussed features including forcing execution of "a predefined additional processing corresponding to one or more file types when an instruction of the additional processing is determined", "domains of the file storage unit corresponding to file types into dated domains based on date information of the input files", as taught by the claimed invention.

B. Walsh adds nothing to the teachings of Wright and Kaplan. In particular, Walsh only discusses sorting songs by genre, artist, etc., based on hierarchical identifiers (see, col. 5, lines 41-42).

However, the cited references do not teach or suggest system and method that "sorts the input files" including "music files" in divided domains, including handling "instructions" pertaining to the files from clients as taught by the claimed invention (see, claims 8, 10, 12 and 13).

C. In Boesch, input data files are stored in accordance with the kind (see, paragraph 23). In contrast the present invention "stores the input file in a domain of the file storage unit corresponding to each file type" (claim 4). Meaning, upon receipt of a signal from the client, the server generates a file name, and stores entered data files divided into areas of dates on the basis of the date information of the entered data file. This configuration is not disclosed in any of the cited references.

D. On the other hand, Delaney only discusses a processing apparatus with an additional processing specified in advance (see, col. 5, lines 5-9). Delaney does not teach or suggest, for example as recited in claim 11, "when the input file is an image file, the additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to print out by the printer."

The invention of claim 11, for example, when the user wishes to perform printing by a printer simultaneously with file storage, processing other than file storage can be executed by "an additional processing" by switch operation of the server in advance, thereby causing printing output by the printer simultaneously with file storage.

- E. Moreover, since Microsoft merely discusses personal folders that are created by a user and profile of users when more than one person uses a computer, Microsoft does not add to the teachings of the other references with respect to the claimed invention.
- F. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 4, "the processing unit stores the input file in a domain of the file storage unit corresponding to each file type." The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest storing the input file in "a domain... corresponding to each file type", as recited in claim 4.

As to A, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wright et al. – Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the embodiment server-client relationship with third party vendor clients. Wright et al. – Figure 2, the Paper gateway is a file I/O unit. Together, they disclose "a file I/O unit which inputs and outputs a file from said clients."

Wright, et al. – Page 9, paragraph 0098 recites the paper gateway storing data in accordance with instructions for processing and storage of document images. Said instructions are rules. Therefore, Wright et al. disclose "a processing unit which stores the file input from the file I/O unit into the file storage unit in conformity with a predefined processing rule."

Kaplan et al. – page 2, paragraph 6 recites the client's ability to configure automatic playback which is an instruction for additional processing; Kaplan et al. - Page 1, paragraph 0004 recites CD and DVD type files for automatic playback. Together, Kaplan et al. disclose "a predefined additional processing corresponding to one or more file types when an instruction of the additional processing is determined."

Prior to this amendment, the limitation "domains of the file storage unit corresponding to file types into dated domains based on date information of the input files" resided in dependent claims that have been cancelled and moved into the independent claims. Applicant is correct that the combination of Wright et al. and Kaplan et al. does not teach this limitation. However, in the prior office action, Examiner cited Walsh et al. as teaching this limitation in combination with Wright et al. and Kaplan et al. Said teaching is found below in this office action.

As to B, Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, songs on computers are "music files." Also, Walsh et al. was relied upon to teach the sorting of different file types, which is what it discloses at the citations presented. When used in combination with the other cited references, "sorts the input files" including "music files" in divided domains,

including handling "instructions" pertaining to the files from clients is disclosed. Said teaching is found below in this office action.

As to C, Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Boesch reference, in paragraph 23 as indicated by the Applicant, does not mention "kind", but rather "type" of file, just as the claim language in this application.

As to D, Examiner respectfully disagrees. The cited reference discloses "Where the recipient device 22 comprises a computing system 24, the image file data is transmitted to the computing device 30 which receives the data and preferably automatically sends the data to its associated printer 32 to print a hardcopy of each image sent to the recipient (block 314)," which reads directly on "when the input file is an image file, the additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to print out by the printer."

As to E, the argument is moot. Claim 5, for which Microsoft was relied upon by the Examiner, has been cancelled by the Applicant.

As to F, Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the previous office action, Boesch teaches this limitation. In addition, Microsoft also teaches the limitation "a domain of the file storage unit corresponding to each file type." With "My Pictures" and "My Music" as examples.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 9) The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 10) Claims 9-13 and 16 recite the limitation "the electronic apparatus." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Said "electronic apparatus" is not mentioned in parent claims 1 and 14 as amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 11) Claims 1, 2, 3, 8-10, 12-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0075514 A1 (Wright et al.), and further in view of US 2002/0180803 A1 (Kaplan et al.) and US 6,965,770 B2 (Walsh et al.).

As to Claim 1, Wright et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including a server connected with one or more clients (Wright et al. – Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the embodiment server-client relationship with third party vendor clients), comprising:

a file I/O unit which inputs and outputs a file from said clients (Wright et al. – Figure 2, the Paper gateway is a file I/O unit); and

a file storage unit which stores a data file (Wright et al. – Page 1, Figure 2, the Document Repositories are file storage units; Page 2, paragraph 0002 recites document image files containing data and instructions); and

a processing unit which stores the file input from the file I/O unit into the file storage unit in conformity with a predefined processing rule (Wright, et al. – Page 9, paragraph 0098 recites the paper gateway storing data in accordance with instructions for processing and storage of document images. Said instructions are rules); and

wherein the processing unit generates a file name for each of input files, divides inside domains of the file storage unit corresponding to file types into dated domains based on date information of the input files, [sic] stores the input files by date with the file names imparted thereto (Wright, et al. – Page 8, paragraph 0090 recites the image index database storing image files according to fields, including indexed document name, into the image repository; Page 8, paragraph 0087 further defines the image repository to contain directories and sub-directories storing the image file type; Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the creation of a file name based on date and serial number; Pages 9 and 10, paragraph 0104 recites storing according to user defined database filing instructions).

Wright et al. do not disclose, but Kaplan et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including an additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to one or more file types when an instruction of the additional processing is determined (Kaplan et al. – page 2, paragraph 6 recites the client's ability to configure automatic playback which is an instruction for additional processing; Page 1, paragraph 0004 recites CD and DVD type files for automatic playback).

Wright et al. do not disclose, but Walsh et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including sorts the input files (Walsh et al. – Column 5, lines 41-42 recite sorting files based on type including title).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by Kaplan et al., with the file I/O, storage and conformity to processing rules taught by Wright et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to provide a means to allow a user to automatically execute media files without additional intervention (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the file sorting by name and date taught by Walsh et al., with the file I/O, storage and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al. and Kaplan et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to allow the user to sort files for efficiency of storage and retrieval (Walsh et al. – Column 5, lines 40-49).

As to Claim 2, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1,

wherein the file I/O unit inputs a file from a medium connected directly or via an adaptor to a medium connection port of the apparatus (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006 recites the inputting of a file via removable media being inserted into a host apparatus' connection port).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the inputting of files via a connection port taught by Kaplan et al., with the file I/O, storage and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to allow a user to input files into a host via a connection port (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006).

As to Claim 3, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1,

wherein the file I/O unit inputs an image file or a music file (Kaplan, Figure 1 recites the use of image and music files).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the use of music and image files taught by Kaplan et al., with the file I/O, storage and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to provide, among other auto-executable files, the use of image and sound files for user enjoyment (Kaplan et al. – Page 1, paragraph 0002).

As to Claim 8, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1,

wherein the processing unit generates file names with serial numbers added to the date information of the input files (Wright et al. - Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the creation of a file name based on date and serial number), and

divides inside of the domains of the file storage unit corresponding to file types into dated domains (Wright et al. - Page 8, paragraph 0090 recites the image index database storing image files according to fields, including indexed document name, into the image repository; Page 8, paragraph 0087 further defines the image repository to contain directories and sub-directories storing the image file type; Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the creation of a file name based on date and serial number; Pages 9 and 10, paragraph 0104 recites storing according to user defined database filing instructions), and

sorts (Walsh et al. - Column 5, lines 41-42 recite sorting files based on type including title, which when combined with Wright et al. and Kaplan et al. is determined to be filename since the file names are based on date and serial number; Wright et al. - Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the creation of a file name based on date and serial number) and

stores the input files by date with the file names imparted thereto (Wright et al. - Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the creation of a file name based on date and serial number).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the filename creation based on date and serial number taught by Wright et al., with the file I/O, file naming, sorting, storage segregated by date,

Art Unit: 2146

and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to allow the user to associate file names with their associated date of import or capture to assist in determining date of importation of the files.

The motivation and obviousness arguments for sorting are the same as in claim 7.

As to Claim 9, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1,

wherein the electronic apparatus is a server (Wright et al. – Page 11, paragraph 0118 recites the use of a server; Kaplan, Figure 10, item 158 also indicates the use of a server), and

wherein the additional processing instruction unit recognizes and handles an instruction of additional processing from manipulation of a switch disposed on the apparatus (Kaplan et al. – Pages 1 and 2, paragraph 5 recite the multimedia management system's ability to provide user configurable playback).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the server taught by Wright et al. and the additional

processing instruction unit that recognizes and handles an instruction of additional processing from manipulation of a switch disposed on the apparatus taught by Kaplan et al., with the file I/O, file naming, storage segregated by date, and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use a server to facilitate connection of many devices, and would have been motivated to allow the user to determine whether or not to automatically play or print the music or image files since automatically playing or printing may not be a desired action as resources would be wasted on printing images the user does not want to be printed.

The motivation and obviousness arguments for the additional processing instruction unit recognizes and handles an instruction of additional processing from manipulation of a switch disposed on the apparatus are the same as in claim 1.

As to Claim 10, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including server according to claim 1, wherein the electronic apparatus is a server (Wright et al. – Page 11, paragraph 0118 recites the use of a server; Kaplan, Figure 10, item 158 also indicates the use of a server), and

wherein the additional processing instruction unit recognizes and handles an instruction of additional processing from the client (Kaplan et al. – page 2, paragraph 6 recites the client's ability to configure automatic playback which is an instruction for additional processing).

The motivation and obviousness arguments for the additional processing instruction unit recognizes and handles an instruction of additional processing from the client are the same as in claim 1.

As to Claim 12, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1,

wherein the electronic apparatus is a server (Wright et al. – Page 11, paragraph 0118 recites the use of a server; Kaplan, Figure 10, item 158 also indicates the use of a server), and

wherein when the input file is a music file, the additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to play back music by the client (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006 recites the automatic playback of multimedia files, which include music files, when removable media is inserted into a reading device; the additional processing unit being the media management system).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of when the input file is a music file, the additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to play back music by

Art Unit: 2146

the client taught by Kaplan et al., with the file I/O, file naming, sorting, storage segregated by date, and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to allow the system to automatically play music files based on the user's preference of whether or not to have to perform any additional functions or operations (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006).

As to Claim 13, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1,

wherein the electronic apparatus is a server (Wright et al. – Page 11, paragraph 0118 recites the use of a server; Kaplan, Figure 10, item 158 also indicates the use of a server); and .

wherein when the input file is a music file, the additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to generate a play list and send it with the music file to a music electronic apparatus (Walsh et al. – Column 14, Lines 39-49 recite the automatic creation of a play list and sending the list to a scheduler which controls a speaker).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of when the input file is a music file, the

additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to generate a play list and send it with the music file to a music electronic apparatus taught by Walsh et al., with the file I/O, file naming, storage segregated by date, and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to allow the user to prioritize the music to be played into a list (Walsh et al. – Column 14, Lines 41-43).

As to Claim 14, Wright et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including a processing method of a server connected with one or more clients, (Wright et al. – Page 13, paragraph 0145 recites a method; Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the embodiment server-client relationship with third party vendor clients) comprising:

inputting a file from said clients (Wright et al. – Figure 2, the Paper gateway is a file I/O unit); and

storing the input file into the file storage unit in conformity with a predefined processing rule corresponding to [sic] file type[sic] (Wright, et al. – Page 9, paragraph 0098 recites the paper gateway storing files in accordance with instructions for processing and storage of document images. Said instructions are rules); and

wherein said storing includes generating a file name for each of input files, dividing inside domains of the file storage unit corresponding to file types into dated domains based on date information of the input files, [sic] storing the input files by date with the file names imparted thereto (Wright, et al. – Page 8, paragraph 0090 recites the image index database storing image files according to fields, including indexed document name, into the image repository; Page 8, paragraph 0087 further defines the image repository to contain directories and sub-directories storing the image file type; Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the creation of a file name based on date and serial number; Pages 9 and 10, paragraph 0104 recites storing according to user defined database filing instructions).

Wright et al. do not disclose, but Kaplan et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including executing an additional processing, when the instruction of the additional processing is determined, effecting on the input file predefined additional processing corresponding to one or more file types (Kaplan et al. – page 2, paragraph 6 recites the client's ability to configure automatic playback which is an instruction for additional processing; Page 1, paragraph 0004 recites CD and DVD type files for executing automatic playback).

Wright et al. do not disclose, but Walsh et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including sorting the input files (Walsh et al. – Column 5, lines 41-42 recite sorting files based on type including title).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an additional processing step of, when the instruction of

the additional processing is determined, effecting on the input file predefined additional processing corresponding to the file type taught by Kaplan et al., with the file input, storage and conformity to processing rules taught by Wright et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to provide a means to allow a user to automatically execute media files without additional intervention (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006).

The motivation and obviousness arguments for using Walsh et al. are the same as in Claim 1.

As to Claim 17, Wright et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including a computer readable storage medium which stores a program operable to cause a computer to connected with one or more clients to execute operations, comprising (Wright et al. – Page 15, claim 55 recites a program; Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the embodiment server-client relationship with third party vendor clients):

inputting a file (Wright et al. – Figure 2, the Paper gateway is a file I/O unit);

storing the input file into the file storage unit in conformity with a predefined processing rule corresponding to a file type (Wright, et al. – Page 9, paragraph 0098 recites the paper gateway storing files in accordance with instructions for processing and storage of document images. Said instructions are rules); and

wherein said storing includes generating a file name for each of input files, dividing inside domains of the file storage unit corresponding to file types into dated domains based on date information of the input files, [sic] storing the input files by date

with the file names imparted thereto (Wright, et al. – Page 8, paragraph 0090 recites the image index database storing image files according to fields, including indexed document name, into the image repository; Page 8, paragraph 0087 further defines the image repository to contain directories and sub-directories storing the image file type; Page 6, paragraph 0072 recites the creation of a file name based on date and serial number; Pages 9 and 10, paragraph 0104 recites storing according to user defined database filing instructions).

Wright et al. do not disclose, but Kaplan et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including executing an additional processing, when the instruction of the additional processing is determined, effecting on the input file predefined additional processing corresponding to one or more file types (Kaplan et al. – page 2, paragraph 6 recites the client's ability to configure automatic playback which is an instruction for additional processing; Page 1, paragraph 0004 recites CD and DVD type files for executing automatic playback).

Wright et al. do not disclose, but Walsh et al. disclose an invention substantially as claimed, including sorts the input files (Walsh et al. – Column 5, lines 41-42 recite sorting files based on type including title).

The motivation and obviousness arguments for Kaplan et al. are the same as in claim 14.

The motivation and obviousness arguments for using Walsh et al. are the same as in Claim 1.

12) Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of US 2003/0018746 A1 (Boesch).

As to Claim 4, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1.

The combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. does not disclose, but Boesch discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including wherein the processing unit stores the input file in a domain of the file storage unit corresponding to each file type (Boesch, Page 2, paragraph 0023 recites storing a file according to file type).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the storage of input files in a domain of the file storage unit corresponding to each file type taught by Boesch, with the file I/O, storage and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file

type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to provide a user to store and select files according to a file type (Boesch, Page 2, paragraph 0023).

13) Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. as applied to claim 7 above, and in further view of US 6,831,754 B1 (Delaney).

As to Claim 11, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the server according to claim 1,

wherein the electronic apparatus is a server (Wright et al. – Page 11, paragraph 0118 recites the use of a server; Kaplan, Figure 10, item 158 also indicates the use of a server).

The combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. does not disclose, but Delaney discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including wherein when the input file is an image file, the additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to print out by the printer (Delaney, Column 5, Lines 5-9 recite images files being automatically printed when received).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of when the input file is an image file, the additional processing instruction unit forces the processing unit to print out by the printer taught by Delaney, with the file I/O, file naming, storage segregated by date, and conformity to processing and additional processing instruction unit which forces the processing unit to execute a predefined additional processing corresponding to a file type when an instruction of the additional processing is determined taught by the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to allow the system to automatically print images based on the user's preference (Delaney, Column 5, lines 5-9).

14) Claims 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. as applied to claims 14 and 17 respectively, and in further view of US 6,831,754 B1 (Delaney).

As to Claim 16, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the processing method according to claim 14, wherein the electronic apparatus is a server (Wright et al. – Page 11, paragraph 0118 recites the use of a server; Kaplan, Figure 10, item 158 also indicates the use of a server), and

wherein the additional processing includes, when the input file is an image file, forcing a printer connected to the server to print out (Delaney, Column 5, Lines 5-9 recite images files being automatically printed when received), and

wherein the additional processing includes, when the input file is a music file, forcing a client connected to the server to play back music (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006 recites the automatic playback of multimedia files, which include music files, when removable media is inserted into a reading device; the additional processing unit being the media management system).

The motivation and obviousness arguments for Delaney are the same as in claim 11.

As to Claim 19, the combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including the storage medium according to claim 17, wherein the additional processing includes,

when the input file is a music file, forcing a client connected to the server to play back music (Kaplan et al. – Page 2, paragraph 0006 recites the automatic playback of multimedia files, which include music files, when removable media is inserted into a reading device; the additional processing unit being the media management system).

The combination of Wright et al., Kaplan et al. and Walsh et al. does not disclose, but Delaney discloses an invention substantially as claimed, including wherein the additional processing step includes, when the input file is an image file, forcing a printer

connected to the server to print out (Delaney, Column 5, Lines 5-9 recite images files being automatically printed when received).

The motivation and obviousness arguments for Delaney are the same as in claim 11.

Conclusion

15)Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard G. Keehn whose telephone number is 571-270-5007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:30am - 7:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RGK

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146